

The Washington Board

*Informing Professional
Engineers and Professional
Land Surveyors of the events
and developments that affect
their professions*



Journal

Number 35 • Spring 2005

YOUR BOARD MEMBERS

Nancy Miller-Duevel, PE, Chair
Renton

Ying Fay Chan, PE, Vice-chair
Olympia

Albert J. Hebrank, Jr., PLS
Auburn

Hal Williamson, PE
Richland

Lisa Brown, PE
Spokane

Mel Garland, PLS
Covington

Daniel Parker, PE,
Journal Editor,
Auburn

George A. Twiss, PLS
Executive Director, Tacoma

Administrative services are provided to the Board by the Department of Licensing. The Department and the Board have a policy of providing equal access to their services. If you need special accommodation, please call (360) 664-1575 or TTY (360) 664-8885.

INSIDE:

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR 2

NEWS TO YOU

| | |
|--|---|
| Gifts—Influence or Friendship? | 3 |
| A Sampling from the NSPE Board of Ethical Review | 4 |
| As the Courts See It | 6 |
| A Reminder for those Practicing Structural Engineering | 6 |
| Board Tries to Define . . . Survey Research | 7 |
| How Times Have Changed | 8 |
| It's Time for a Reminder | 8 |
| Q&A | 9 |

ON-SITE DESIGNER LICENSING

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| On-Site Examination Results | 13 |
|-----------------------------------|----|

EXAMINATIONS

| | |
|--|----|
| October 2004 Examination Results | 14 |
|--|----|

INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT

| | |
|---|----|
| Statistics of Disciplinary Actions Taken by the Board | 15 |
| Summaries Of Investigations | 15 |

SURVEYS

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Incidental Practice Survey | 11 |
| Customer Satisfaction Survey | 19 |

SCHEDULES

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Calendar | 23 |
|----------------|----|

Message from the Chair

The Washington Board Journal is published biannually by the Washington Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, George A. Twiss, P.L.S., Executive Director.

If you, or someone you know, would like to receive a copy of this publication, please contact the Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors.

Mail

405 Black Lake Blvd.,
 Olympia, WA 98502
 – or –
 PO Box 9025
 Olympia, WA 98507-9025

Phone

Board Administration
 (360) 664-1564

Engineer/Land Surveyor
 Licensing
 (360) 664-1575

On-Site Designer Licensing
 (360) 664-1568

Complaints and Investigations
 (360) 664-1571

Fax

(360) 664-2551

E-Mail

Engineers@dol.wa.gov

Web sites

Engineer/Land Surveyor
www.dol.wa.gov/engineers/enfront.htm

On-Site Designers
www.dol.wa.gov/engineers/onsitefront.htm

“The Message from the Chair” is a reflection of the personal opinions and experiences of the Board Chair. Comments in the article may be shared by various members of the Board, but they are not to be interpreted as a policy, position, or consensus of the Board unless specifically so indicated.

From Nancy Miller-Duevel, PE

This will be my last opportunity to write this column as Chair of the Board. There is just over a year remaining of my second five-year term as a member of the Board. I intend to use this article to reminisce about my licensing experience and share with you my perceptions of the licensing process and how my opinions of the process have changed over time.

My path toward licensure began more than thirty-five years ago when I received my Bachelor’s degree in civil engineering. My memory is a bit fuzzy, but as I recall there was little promotion of licensure by my college professors. In the spring of my senior year we received information regarding applying to take the fundamentals exam in the fall. I did not take the fundamentals exam that fall, but I took the exam a year or so later. The format of the fundamentals exam was different in the early 1970’s compared to the format of the exam today. The exam was open-book with a morning session composed of short multiple-choice questions and an afternoon session of longer problems to solve.

By the time I was ready to apply for my PE license, I had moved to Texas where a license was granted based on experience, and passage of the principles and practice examination was not required. I received my first PE license based on my experience.

Knowing that my Texas license would not suffice if I ever needed comity in other states, I applied for licensure in neighboring Oklahoma and took the principles and practice exam. At that time, the exam consisted of essay type problems to solve, and the licensure candidate selected the problems he/she would solve. A candidate picked four problems to solve in the morning session and four problems to solve in the afternoon. I elected to apply for licensing as a structural engineer, and that election limited the problems I was allowed to solve to seven structural engineering problems and an economics problem. For me there was no choice of problems. That was all right with me; I couldn’t have solved any of the other problems anyway. I remember the principles and practice exam really testing what I had learned through my experience as a structural engineer.

Upon moving to Washington, I subjected myself to the torturous 16-hour Western States structural exam. For me there was never any question as to whether I would take the structural exam. I believed any engineer who practiced in the field of structural engineering should pursue the additional structural engineering credential.

I have always believed that a licensing process based on a combination of education, experience and examinations was the best way to assure competency in the engineering profession and protect the public. When I first became a member of the Board, I thought a licensing process that included examinations was not only the best way to license engineers, but such a process was the only way to assure competency of the engineering profession. Over my nine years on the Board, my views and opinions have changed.

Continues on page 18

News to You

Gifts – Influence or Friendship

Some events over the past few years have presented “nagging” questions to the Board on the topic of acceptable bounds on gifts and entertainment. What value and type of gift will influence judgement such that it constitutes unprofessional conduct? How can a gesture of friendship or gratitude be distinguished from an attempt to buy a favor? Does the Board need to define boundaries through the rule making process, or is there an acceptable industry standard upon which to rely? The Board would appreciate your input on the answers to these questions and your insights and opinions on current practices and trends in the engineering and surveying professions. Your input should be directed to Ron Torrence at the Board address or to rtorrence@dol.wa.gov.

Section 18.43.105 of the Engineers Registration Act states that the board may take disciplinary action for “(1) Offering to pay, paying or accepting, either directly or indirectly, any substantial gift, bribe, or other consideration to influence the award of professional work.” “WAC 196-27A-030 Explicit Acts of Misconduct,” expands on this issue in paragraphs (10) and (11). However, what constitutes a substantial gift or other consideration has not been clearly defined in Law or Rule. Licensees that wish to be beyond question on their conduct may be at a disadvantage in competing for contract awards against those that rationalize lavish entertainment and expensive gifts as inconsequential relative to potential profits on projects in contention and the cost of doing business. Is it strictly a business decision or does professional ethics impose a limit on what is generally acceptable? Undisclosed cash exchanges are definitely unprofessional conduct and Christmas cards are clearly within the bounds of acceptability. But what about a \$300 bottle of 30-year single malt scotch whiskey, tickets to the Super Bowl, a lavish top scale dinner with expensive wine, or a week-end excursion to a luxury resort hotel? Is value the only criteria; may the same gift be judged differently based on intent or purpose? What difference might the wealth or income of the recipient make? That \$300 bottle of scotch would influence a first line supervisor a lot more than it would most CEOs. Some companies have ethics

policies that limit the value and types of gifts that an employee can accept from clients or suppliers to an inconsequential value (usually less than \$25), while authorizing lavish expenditures for potential and current client entertainment under the heading of business development. Some potential clients may give a supplier an opportunity to comprehensively present their services only under highly pleasurable circumstances, thus seminars are held at resort hotels. When does catering to the customer become inappropriate influence on the award of work?

The National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) Board of Ethical Review (BER) has on several occasions addressed situations involving gifts or entertainment. Over the prior fifty years the BER has considered situations submitted by anyone with a question on appropriate ethical behavior by engineers. These cases have been judged by reference to the NSPE Code of Ethics. The judgements are advisory and intended for guidance and education rather than disciplinary actions. The facts, discussion, and conclusion of the BER deliberations on each case have been documented and are available to anyone by going to the NSPE web site www.nspe.org and “clicking” on the “Ethics” button or perhaps more directly by going to the index on the following page: <http://www.niee.org/pdd.cfm?pt=NIEE&doc=EthicsCases>.

A survey of titles to locate cases related to the topic resulted in the list below. The first number of a Case is the last two digits of the year in which it was considered.

| CASE | TITLE |
|-------------|--|
| 87-5 | Gift—Complimentary Seminar Registration |
| 79-8 | Gift to Public Official |
| 87-4 | Gift—Sharing of Hotel Suite |
| 60-9 | Gifts |
| 81-4 | Gifts to Engineers |
| 76-6 | Gifts to Foreign Officials |
| 96-5 | Gifts to Foreign Officials |
| 65-10 | Promotion of Engineering Services—Hospitality Suites |
| 65-17, 72-3 | Promotion of Services through Direct Mail Solicitation |

| | |
|-------|--|
| 70-1 | Promotional Distribution of Planning Report |
| 95-3 | Promotional Efforts — Providing Referral Fees to a Contractor |
| 82-1 | Promotional Letters |
| 75-12 | Promotional Seminar |
| 66-7 | Sponsorship of Social Hour |

Because the BER conclusions are intended to provide education and guidance there may be question as to their applicability as a basis for disciplinary actions. They may appear highly restrictive on the profession, but this seems the best standard of practice for the profession available to the Board. Please review some of these cases and let us know what you think. Is this a standard of practice you expect enforced? Is this the standard of practice that you want the profession measured by in Washington? If not, what alternative would you suggest? We'll try to summarize your comments and suggestions in a future Journal issue.

A Sampling E Board Of Ethical Review

[The following article is published with the permission of the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE). This opinion is based on data submitted to the NSPE Board of Ethical Review and does not necessarily represent all of the pertinent facts when applied to a specific case. This opinion is for educational purposes only and should not be construed as expressing any opinion on the ethics of specific individuals. This opinion may be reprinted without further permission, provided that this statement is included before or after the text of the case.]

As many of you already know the National Society of Professional Engineers plays an active role in keeping its members informed about developments in engineering practice. Part of that effort involves their Board of Ethical Review and the case studies they publish in *Engineering Times*. The following is a case evaluation involving ethical questions that the Board of Registration felt would be sound information for all our registrants. It does not represent facts related to any past or ongoing Board investigation.

GIFT TO PUBLIC OFFICIAL

Facts:

Engineer A, a principal in an engineering firm which had performed work for a local water district, gave Engineer B, the executive director of the water district, a hunting rifle. This fact was reported in the local newspaper, quoting other public officials in the community to the effect that it was improper for the executive director to keep the rifle in light of the relationship between the water district and Engineer A. One of the quoted officials commented that he did not object to small personal gifts, but it was “inappropriate” to keep an “expensive” rifle, noting that the executive director had “considerable influence” in the award of contracts. The cost of the rifle was not given, but local engineers who raised the question from the standpoint of engineering ethics estimated its retail value at \$500.

Questions:

1. Was it ethical for Engineer A to give a public official of an agency with whom he has had contractual relations a personal gift, as described?
2. Was it ethical for Engineer B to accept the gift of Engineer A?

NSPE CODE REFERENCES:

Code 3

“The Engineer will avoid all conduct or practice likely to discredit the profession or deceive the public.”

Code 11(b)

“He will not pay, or offer to pay, either directly or indirectly, any political contribution, or a gift, or other consideration in order to secure work. He will not pay a commission, percentage, or brokerage fee in order to secure work except to bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or marketing agencies retained by him.”

DISCUSSION:

Before turning to the substantive question, we emphasize that our purpose is restricted to dealing with the ethics of the two engineers involved in the statement of facts, and not to pass upon the political or legal aspects of the case.

As indicated in the facts, we are concerned again with the problem of defining the intent of the engineer offering a gift. Was it given “ . . . in order to secure

work,” or was the gift a reflection of a purely personal relationship having no bearing on the award of contracts for professional services?

It is obviously not possible to answer these questions in a clear and positive way, without knowing what was in the mind of the donor. As long ago as 1960, however, we dealt with a similar case and made the following observation:

The question of when a gift is intended to or becomes an inducement to influence one's impartial decision, as distinguished from an expression of friendship or a social custom, has remained a perplexing one over the years. No blanket rule covering all situations has been discovered. The size of the gift is usually a material factor, but must be related to the circumstances of the gift. It would hardly be felt a token gift, such as a cigar, a desk calendar, etc., would be prohibited. It has been customary in the business world for friends and business associates to tender such tokens of recognition or appreciation, and 'picking up the tab' at a business luncheon or dinner is commonplace and well accepted in the mores of our society.

Recognizing the difficulties inherent in passing judgment on each instance, we believe the Canons and Rules state, in substance, that an engineer may neither offer nor receive a gift which is intended to or will influence his independent professional judgment. The full application of this principle requires the impossible—that we read the state of mind of the donor or donee. Therefore, we must apply a criterion which reasonable men might reasonably infer from the circumstances; that the giving or acceptance of the benefit be a matter of 'good taste,' and such that among reasonable men it might not be of a nature which raises suspicions of favoritism.

Applying these general principles to the situations at hand, we think that an occasional free luncheon or dinner, or a Christmas or birthday present when there is a personal relationship, is acceptable practice. On the other hand, cash payments to those in a position to influence decisions favorable or unfavorable to the giver are not in good taste and do immediately raise a suspicion that there is an ulterior motive. Likewise, a very expensive gift has a connotation of placing the recipient in a position of obligation. (Case 60-9).

In addition to the ethical concern of Engineer A's action, in this situation we also have to consider the application of Code 11(b) to the role of Engineer B in accepting the gift. A literal reading of Code 11(b) re-

stricts its application to those who make the gift for the purpose of securing work. Under that reading, Code 11(b) would not apply to Engineer B, which may suggest that the code language in point should be revised to broaden its application to cover this type of situation.

The fact that Code 11(b) does not specifically apply to Engineer B, however, does not mean that he may escape ethical responsibility for his acceptance of the gift. We think that Code 3 comes into play under these facts. The mandate of that provision is that engineers must avoid conduct, which may “likely” discredit the profession. Whether or not Engineer B might be influenced to favor Engineer A in the future, it seems inescapable that the acceptance of the gift by an engineer holding public office would expose the profession to public scorn and suspicion of wrongdoing.

We turn to another semantic problem of Code 11(b); it is written in terms of a gift “. . . to secure work,” whereas under this set of facts Engineer A had had a previous commission with the agency, but was not then known to be seeking further work from the agency. It may be reasonably assumed that Engineer A would continue to seek further assignments from the water district in view of his previous work. If the gift were intended to enhance his position it would be within the meaning of the present language.

Again recognizing the difficulty of knowing what was in the minds of the two engineers, we believe that when Code 11(b) is read in conjunction with Code 3, the result must be that both the giving and receiving of the gift was ethically improper. Even giving both engineers the benefit of the doubt as to their intentions, the controlling factor is the impression created in the public mind. Utilizing the criteria set forth in NSPE Case 60-9, we need not decide precisely whether a \$500 gift is too much to qualify as a “token” gift; it is enough that it is well beyond a nominal expression of friendship or esteem.

CONCLUSION:

1. It was not ethical for Engineer A to give a public official of an agency with whom he has had contractual relations a personal gift, as described.
2. It was not ethical for Engineer B to accept the gift of Engineer A.

As the Courts See It

[The following is an abbreviated summary of the cited case. All details and arguments are not included due to space limitations in this publication. It is provided for information only and should not be construed to contain applicable legal arguments affecting licensure in Washington.]

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA, FOURTH DISTRICT

Joseph E. Gaudet, appellant v. Florida Board of Professional Engineers, Appellee.

Mr. Gaudet applied for licensure as a professional engineer in the state of Florida based upon his education from Pennsylvania, existing licensure in Pennsylvania and accumulated experience. Joseph E. Gaudet appeals a Final Order of the Florida Board of Professional Engineers (“Board”) denying his petition for licensure as an engineer by endorsement. Gaudet is a 1985 graduate of Drexel University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, from which he earned a Bachelor of Science in Commerce and Engineering Sciences degree. Since receiving his degree, Gaudet has practiced as a full-time engineer. He obtained his engineering license from the State of Pennsylvania in 2001. Because the degree Gaudet had received was not shown as accredited by Engineering Accredited Commission (EAC) of the Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET), the Florida Board denied his application basing said decision upon the rules promulgated by the Board that would only accept an EAC/ABET degree.

Gaudet contends that the Board erroneously interpreted rules in concluding that he was not entitled to a license. He argues that the Board was required to review his education and could not rely solely upon whether Drexel University’s program was ABET accredited. He further maintains that the Board was required to review Pennsylvania’s licensing criteria. Gaudet asserts that the Board abdicated the responsibilities mandated by the statute. He argues that the Board should have adopted rules that fully comply with its responsibility to review all degrees; that the Board could not lawfully delegate to ABET the obligations delegated to the Board by the Florida Legislature.

The Board disputes that it is required by Florida law to “conduct an independent evaluation of [Gaudet’s] education” or that it is required to review domestic

degrees that are not ABET accredited. The Board also argues that it was Gaudet’s duty to present evidence that Pennsylvania conducted such an evaluation before that state permitted him to utilize his non-accredited educational background to qualify for a license in that state.

The Appellate court is not at liberty to re-write the legislative enactment by adding the words “in lieu of” that are simply not there. The court holds that the Board promulgate rules to review schools and courses of study and that the adoption of rules providing for the acceptance of the approval and accreditation of schools and courses of study by a nationally accepted accreditation organization does not relieve the Board of the duty to adopt the required rules.

If the Board is of the opinion that the interests of the citizens of Florida would best be served by allowing only graduates of ABET accredited schools to become engineers, it can seek a legislative amendment that creates such a requirement. As precedent on the admission to the practice of law makes clear, an accreditation requirement is not an abdication of supervisory responsibility over admissions to a profession; nor is it the unlawful delegation of authority to a private body.

WHAT WASHINGTON BOARD SAYS:

Washington Law and Board rules do not require education as a condition for licensure. In addition, while the EAC/ABET degree is the most common path that applicants use to obtain licensure, the Board considers degrees from various schools and curricula on their own merit and grants experience credit based upon provisions the Board adopted in title 196 WAC.

A Reminder for Those Practicing Structural Engineering

This is a reminder to all who practice in structural engineering to pay particular attention to Chapter 17 of 2003 IBC. This is the chapter on “Structural Tests and Inspections.” The structural inspection requirements that are made as a condition of a permit, are more extensive than in the old UBC. One structural design group that contacted the Board about this new requirement noted that their group was still working to come up to speed on all the requirements of this code but that they were going to have to tell their clients that structural designs, that required a few hours under the old code, may now require a week or more to complete under the new code.

Board Attempts to Define What Needs to be Included in Survey Research

Over the past year the Board has had reason to look into the practice of a land surveyor based upon a complaint alleging that they had performed insufficient research. The conclusion of the Board revealed that current rules did not provide sufficient detail to put land surveyors “on notice” on what research they were expected to perform. Yet, while the investigation that drew the Board’s attention was concluded without action, the question had been raised and appeared to need some resolution.

In recent weeks members of the Board have undertaken an effort to develop basic parameters on property deed research. But as one could expect, such an effort would never be very successful unless it included input from practicing land surveyors around the state. To that end the following “**DRAFT**” is being distributed to see how licensees feel on the subject.

This is an important issue that the Board believes needs attention. Please take a few minutes to look this over and email [engineers@dol.wa.gov] us with your comments. We will capture that information and include it in this fall’s Journal.

DRAFT POLICY

“Property Deed Research Guidance Document”
February 2005

As derived from the language in the Survey Recording act, chapter 58.09 RCW and the Survey Standards, chapter 332-130 WAC.

THE PROBLEM

Executing a survey without adequate property deed research is contrary to the standard of care of the profession and can result in incorrect interpretations and judgments affecting the client as well as possible Board enforcement action against a licensee. Typically, failure to do adequate research happens when one interprets and/or relies upon a single description and fails to research its consistency throughout the chain of title.

THE PURPOSE

Superficial or inadequate research is now being observed more and more frequently as the Board is called upon to investigate complaints against licensed land

surveyors. To address this, and to stem the trend that the Board is seeing through its investigations, the following steps are provided to help licensees understand the standard of care expected and to clarify the steps so that the surveyor can reasonably recognize when sufficient research has been completed.

THE PROCESS

Prior to performing a boundary survey the minimum steps the surveyor of record shall perform are:

- Obtain a copy of the current recorded deed description of the property to be surveyed. *An Assessor’s parcel description is not sufficient to meet this requirement. It may be beneficial for the surveyor to obtain written confirmation that no unrecorded transactions have been executed that could affect portions of the land or any rights pertaining thereto subsequent to the date of the deed first above mentioned have been conveyed to others.*
- Secure a copy of the most recent conveyance of every adjoining property. *The extent of this element is largely governed through how the text in the adjoining parcel descriptions relates to the subject parcel.*
- Examine all of those deeds for potential conflicts, contradictions, ambiguities, gaps, overlaps, and junior/senior rights.
- In the absence of such conflicts, completion of those three steps will have satisfied the minimum requirement for “Adequate Property Deed Research.”

It is important to note that with the existence of conflicts in the deeds studied, the path for the surveyor to follow to resolve or clarify the problem can be extensive and time consuming. It would be difficult in this guidance document to illustrate all possible steps to follow since each situation and nature of conflict will be different.

Additional assistance through a title company or other sources may be the best choice to consider. The Surveyor may need to obtain, or produce, an *Abstract of Title* of the subject property back to one of the following points.

1. A typographic or other error is found in the chain of title or a neighboring chain of title which explains any problem uncovered in earlier research, OR
2. A point of time is reached when a common grantor conveyed the conflicting properties so that junior/

senior rights or a condition of ambiguity may be discovered (see ensuing paragraph re ambiguity). OR

3. The original grant or patent from the United States has been reached and examined.

THE SUMMARY

An integral step in the performance of a correct and well-documented boundary survey is the need to conduct adequate research and analysis of the deeds and real estate transactions impacting the property description. As stated before, a thorough job of title research to look for the correct legal description can be a tedious, time-consuming and costly process. The above process is not meant to encompass all situations, but to define what is considered the minimal level of property deed research so that a surveyor has executed their duties in a way that safeguards the life, health, and property, and promotes the public welfare.

How Times Have Changed

Things certainly have changed, especially in the knowledge a professional surveyor needs to pass the professional exam. The following are some examples of questions that appeared in the 1938 Washington State Professional Land Surveyors Exam. How easy these questions are to answer may be an indication of how long you have been licensed.

1. What are the necessary adjustments of a transit?
2. Explain the system of dividing public lands. Cover the following points:
 - a. Base Line.
 - b. Principal Meridian.
 - c. Townships.
 - d. Guide Meridians.
 - e. Standard Parallels.
3. Describe the difference between Transit Rule and Compass Rule adjustments?
4. Describe how you calculate a “DMD” and what it is used for?
5. In measuring with a steel tape between two fixed points on a day when the air temperature is 30°F, is temperature correction added or subtracted from the distance shown on the tape?
6. Under what circumstances is a meander line a legal boundary of ownership?

It is Time for a Reminder

In June of 2003 the Board sent out a letter to many licensees alerting them to an apparent problem where survey monuments were, from time to time, being destroyed during the construction of a project. The letter, directed to all county and city engineers, licensed engineers of WSDOT, licensed land surveyors and others, was intended to heighten awareness of statutory provisions on the maintaining and replacement of monuments that were subject to disturbance or removal during a construction project such as a road improvement or paving. The distribution of the letter produced its intention and, as a result, the Department of Natural Resources, Public Land Survey Office, has seen a significant increase in their issuance of permits for monument removal and replacement.

But even with that encouraging outcome we continue to hear of situations where some licensed engineers and land surveyors are not eager or willing to follow what the law says. To help keep this message current and viable in addressing the issue we are repeating much of the text of that letter here again.

LETTER SENT JUNE 17, 2003

Dear Sir or Madam:

Citizens of Washington State have invested in property boundaries and survey monuments since before Statehood. These monuments are not only important to delineate public and private ownership; they are critical. However, property corners and survey monuments are often endangered, and in many cases destroyed, by road and utility construction and maintenance. In 1969, **RCW 58.24.040 (8)** initiated a process to protect these monument assets and responsibility was assigned to a variety of governmental and professional people. Employees of government agencies responsible for the work must take the lead in following this law and thereby protect these monuments. Each agency should adopt as their “best practice” a monument protection plan, which follows the temporary “monument removal permit process” outlined in Chapter 332-120 WAC. Noncompliance by Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors is considered a violation of law to be managed by the Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors. Anyone performing construction or maintenance activities should consider the following:

1. No survey monument shall be removed or destroyed

(the physical disturbance or covering of a monument such that the survey point is no longer visible or readily accessible) before a permit is obtained from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). WAC 332-120-030(2) states “It shall be the responsibility of the governmental agency or others performing construction work or other activity (including road or street resurfacing projects) to adequately search the records and the physical area of the proposed construction work or other activity for the purpose of locating and referencing any known or existing survey monuments (RCW 58.09.130).

2. Any person, corporation, association, department, or subdivision of the state, county or municipality responsible for an activity that may cause a survey monument to be removed or destroyed shall be responsible for ensuring that the original survey point is perpetuated (WAC 332-120-030(2)).

3. Survey monuments are those monuments marking local control points, geodetic control points, and land boundary survey corners (WAC 332-120-030(3)).

When a monument must be removed during an activity that might disturb or destroy it, a licensed Engineer or Land Surveyor must complete, sign, seal and then file a permit with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). If many monuments are in danger along a proposed construction route, one permit can be issued for the entire project with location and description details outlined for each monument. The permit will alert others that may encounter the construction or maintenance project and location information will be protected until a new monument is placed. In most cases, ***an agency official must be in responsible charge of protecting monuments during maintenance and construction activities within their jurisdiction.*** The DNR link to the permit application for the temporary removal of monuments is <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/htdocs/plso/download.htm>. The form can be sent by email or USPS to PO Box 47060, Olympia, WA 98504-7060.

The Board is encouraged by the improvements seen thus far but not fully satisfied that all licensees are treating this with the significance it deserves. If you are in a capacity of responsible charge over contract specifications or construction activities where survey monuments are within the construction limits, please ensure compliance by instructing appropriate agency/contractor/individual that the permitting process must be followed.

The Washington Board Journal Questions & Answers

Conducting a Review of Engineering Plans

QUESTION:

As a professional engineer I have completed my review of a design by another professional and as per the instructions of the Board I prepared a report that I will be signing and sealing. My question relates to the original design. Is there a way for me to make additions and/or corrections directly to the plans, so that they will reflect the revisions I have made to the design?

ANSWER:

YES. The prohibition that applies to an engineer's review is ***only for the placement of your professional seal on plans/drawings*** that were not prepared under your direct supervision. Since state law says that the use of the seal and signature constitutes “a certification” that the work was done in compliance with Chapter 18.43 RCW, it is not possible to make such a certification unless you controlled the content of the plans.

Conversely, there is no such prohibition for the reviewing engineer to make notations, change drawing information or even place his or her name and signature since such activity would not qualify as a certification as defined in Chapter 18.43 RCW. However, it would be prudent to abide by the following guidance in this regard:

- Conduct a thorough review of the documents and prepare a report that discusses the findings of the review with any supporting calculations and sketches. That report would then be signed and sealed.

- Add any necessary notations / instructions / corrections directly to the plan set or to an additional plan sheet that is attached to the original set making sure that the report and the drawings contain cross-references to each other so that each document can be consulted as needed.
- Add a statement to the plans/drawings that clearly states the nature of the review and the scope of the revisions illustrated.

Finally are the specifications. Specific treatment of the stamping of specifications is found in WAC 196-23-020(4). That rule provides that, “the licensee need only seal/stamp that portion for which the licensee is responsible.” It further goes on to say that there is no requirement that all pages of a bound specification be stamped, especially if a particular page is not an engineering specification.

QUESTION:

I have completed my professional designs for a project and have decided to bind all of the documents together for presentation to my clients and approving agency. I am including in the bound set the design drawings, the calculations and the project specifications. Since some of the specifications contained in the bound set are agency standard details my plan is to prepare a coversheet for the report and sign and seal only the front cover of the bound report. Does this meet the requirements of Chapter 196-23 WAC Stamping and Sealing?

ANSWER:

NO. There are really three separate documents within your bound report and each of them must be treated separately, even though you decide to combine them under a single cover.

First is the treatment of the design drawings. WAC 196-23-020(3) requires; “Every page of a plan set must contain the seal/stamp and signature of the licensee(s) who prepared the work.”

Second are the supporting calculations. While there are no specific references to calculations in the referenced rule, the applicable guidance is found under the text for (1) “Final documents.” In that portion of the rule it states that, “Final documents are those documents that are prepared and distributed for final agency approvals.” Since the calculation sheets were apparently part of the documentation submitted for agency review, all the pages of the calculations should contain the seal and signature.



Survey on Incidental Surveying Practice by Professional Engineers

The Board is currently evaluating its practice of permitting professional engineers to perform *limited* topographic survey mapping. For many years the Board has allowed professional engineers to perform this survey activity under the following guiding policies:

- The activity is within the engineer's competency;
- The activity is performed in accordance with prevailing standards for professional surveyors;
- The resulting information and map is for the exclusive use of the professional engineer who performed the work.

In recent months advice from the office of the Attorney General raises a question on whether the "Engineer's Registration Act" [chapter 18.43 RCW] gives anyone other than a licensed land surveyor the authority to perform topographic mapping. How this question will be answered is uncertain at this time. Yet it is believed that any decision of the Board needs to be made with the consideration of the history of the subject and the impact on those stakeholders most affected.

To that end we are asking all **professional engineers** who currently perform their own topographic measurements or have done so in the past to complete the following survey questionnaire about this topic and their practice. We are not equipped to enable you to complete this survey on line so it will be necessary to remove the completed survey and fax or mail it to the Board office. Fax: (360) 664-2551; PO Box 9025, Olympia, WA 98507-9025. Thank you in advance for taking the time to help in this effort.

(PLEASE CIRCLE THE BEST RESPONSE TO YOUR SITUATION)

1. I have been licensed as a PE in Washington for:
 - a. Less than 5 years
 - b. 5-10 years
 - c. 10-25 years
 - d. More than 25 years
2. My Washington license is in: _____
3. If you completed an engineering degree program and it included some land surveying courses, how many credit hours of surveying courses were included:
 - a. 3
 - b. 6
 - c. 9
 - d. 10 or more
4. Were you aware of the guiding policies listed above?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. My practice can best be described as:
 - a. Small firm, fewer than 5 employees.
 - b. Moderate firm, 5 - 25 employees
 - c. Large firm, more than 25 employees.

6. My practice primarily involves work on projects:

- a. Within a major metropolitan area
- b. In suburban residential areas.
- c. In rural/farming areas.
- d. In remote forest lands

7. My primary clientele can best be described as:

- a. Private home owners
- b. General contractors
- c. Local business / Land Developers
- d. Commercial / Industrial Businesses
- e. Government
- f. Other

8. If you need accurate topographic mapping information and you do not have the resources or interest to perform this yourself, how do you obtain what you need?

- a. Use the topographic information provided by my client.
- b. Obtain what I need from public record sources.
- c. Hire a land surveyor to perform the work I need.
- d. Have the work done under a Land Surveyor employee in our firm.
- e. Combinations two or more of the above.

9. What factors do you consider in determining when you will perform the topographic mapping?
(circle all that apply)

- a. Complexity and accuracy of the topographic information needed.
- b. My knowledge and competency of the work to be performed.
- c. The resources I have at my disposal.
- d. The impact on project schedule.
- e. The impact on project costs.
- f. The reliability of having it done by others.

10. If you perform this work or have it performed under your direct supervision as a PE, on average, how often do you provide this service?

- a. No more than once a month.
- b. 2 to 3 times a month
- c. 3 to 5 times a month
- d. Over 5 times a month

11. If the Board decided to instruct PEs that topographic mapping was no longer permissible under the scope of engineering practice, to what extent would that change in policy shape your practice?

- a. Little or none.
- b. Some inconvenience, no additional costs to clients expected.
- c. Moderate changes that could impact clients.
- d. Significant impact on my practice and organization.
- e. Not certain.

On-Site Designer Licensing

Onsite Program about to get Continuing Education

As many of you know the creation of the On-site Program in 1999 included provisions for the Board to adopt continuing education as part of individual license and certificate of competency renewals. Over most of the last three years, an extensive effort has been undertaken to seek input from stakeholders toward the creation of administrative rules that would guide the CE requirements. The current draft proposal can be found on the Board's On-site website: <http://www.dol.wa.gov/engineers/onsitefront.htm>.

Before we start the formal rule making process we need to hear if this proposal is a workable approach and if further adjustments would be in order. To that end there is a series of workshops scheduled around the state to receive your input. Each workshop session will start at 7:00pm and end when all comments have been received. The scheduled locations and dates are:

| | | |
|------------|---------|---|
| Spokane | May 17 | Spokane Community College (<i>Littlefoot, Room #A</i>) |
| Wenatchee | May 24 | Wenatchee Valley College (<i>Anderson Hall, Room #2047</i>) |
| Olympia | May 25 | DOL Business and Professions (<i>Conference Room #209</i>) |
| Tacoma | May 18 | Tacoma Community College (<i>Senate Room Bldg #11</i>) |
| Tri-Cities | May 31 | Columbia Basin College (<i>Room #A-330</i>) |
| Vancouver | June 1 | Clark County Community College (<i>Central Conference Room</i>) |
| Bremerton | June 7 | Olympic College (<i>Business Bldg, Room #105</i>) |
| Mt. Vernon | June 14 | Cotton Tree Inn (<i>Orcas Room</i>) |

Everett June 15 Everett Community College
(*Index Hall, Room #115*)

Please check our website before attending a workshop for any late changes that may occur in room assignments, or for room locations that have not been set as of this time.

To better help us plan for space needs it would be very helpful for those planning to attend to RSVP to: engineers@dol.wa.gov. by telling us which location you will be attending.

On-Site Examination Results

The Board administered the latest licensing examination for On-site Wastewater Treatment System Designers and Inspectors in October 2004. A total of 29 applicants were approved to take the exam. The following is a breakdown of applicants and performance:

THE RESULTS

| | Designers | Inspectors |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Pass | 12 | 6 |
| Fail | 7 | 3 |
| No-Show | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 19 | 10 |

Examinations

October 2004 Examination Results

| | Total | Pass | % Pass |
|---|-------|------|--------|
| Fundamentals of Engineering (EIT) | 450 | 281 | 62% |
| Principles & Practice of Engineering | | | |
| Chemical | 10 | 7 | 70% |
| Civil | 192 | 101 | 53% |
| Control Systems | 4 | 1 | 25% |
| Electrical | 50 | 27 | 54% |
| Environmental | 12 | 10 | 83% |
| Fire Protection | 9 | 7 | 78% |
| Industrial | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| Mechanical | 57 | 33 | 58% |
| Metallurgical | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| Mining/Mineral | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| Nuclear | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| Petroleum | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| Structural II | 47 | 29 | 62% |
| Structural III | 86 | 18 | 21% |
| Fundamentals of Land Surveying (LSIT) | 30 | 15 | 50% |
| Principles & Practice of Land Surveying (NCEES) | 17 | 14 | 88% |
| WA Specific L S (2-hour) | 46 | 24 | 52% |

Investigations & Enforcement

Statistics of Actions Taken by the Board

JULY 1, 2004 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2004

| | |
|---|----|
| Active investigations as of July, 2004 | 55 |
| Investigations Opened | 20 |
| Investigations Closed | 11 |
| Active Investigations as of December 31, 2004 | 64 |

SUMMARY BY MONTH:

| | Complaints Received | Inquiries Received | Investigations Opened * |
|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| July | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| August | | No Meeting | |
| September | 9 | 2 | 6 |
| October | | No Meeting | |
| November | 10 | 8 | 7 |
| December | 11 | 3 | 6 |
| Totals | 32 | 14 | 20 |

* Investigations can be opened by either a complaint or an inquiry received.

SUMMARY BY PROFESSION AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2004

| | Active Investigations | Compliance Orders |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Prof. Engineers | 20 | 3 |
| Prof. Land Surveyors | 19 | 5 |
| Unlic. Engineers | 6 | 2 |
| Unlic. Land Surveyors | 8 | 0 |
| On-site Designers | 11 | 3 |
| Totals | 64 | 13 |

Summaries of Investigations and Actions by the Board

In the following case summaries you will read of the disciplinary actions against licensees and respondents from July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004. In each disposition the Board accepted the recommendations of the case manager, unless stated otherwise. For those cases involving the issuance of a Board order, each individual will be monitored for compliance.

These summaries are not intended to disclose complete details related to any given investigation or action. While every effort is made to ensure accuracy of the information shown, anyone intending to make a decision based upon this information should contact the Board's compliance officer, John Pettainen, at (360) 664-1571 for available details.

FORMAL ACTIONS:

Donald Kassa

Case No. 03-12-0005

Mr. Kassa, without being licensed to practice as a professional engineer, purchased an engineer's seal, stamped and signed structural engineering documents that were used to support building permit applications for two (2) projects. Said applications, accompanied by Mr. Kassa's sealed/signed structural engineering documents, were submitted to the reviewing jurisdiction.

Confirming through the investigation that the above facts were true, Mr. Kassa was served with a Temporary Cease and Desist order and offered a hearing. With Mr. Kassa not responding, a hearing was held by default, and resulted in a Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Permanent Cease and Desist Order. Said Order prevents Mr. Kassa from practicing engineering and requires he pay a \$20,295 civil fine to the Board.

Concurrent to the Board action, the Island County Prosecutor found Mr. Kassa guilty on 3 felony counts. He was sentenced to jail time, restitution and placed on probation.

Continues next page

Edward J. Fancett, PE**Case No. 01-09-0003**

Edward J. Fancett, PE was the subject of a formal hearing on September 21, 2004 based upon a Statement of Charges issued by the Board June 9, 2004. The charges alleged that Mr. Fancett failed to complete an engineering project he was hired to perform; acted in an incompetent manner in that engineering plans prepared failed to comply with county requirements; and did not communicate with the parties involved in the project. Mr. Fancett was also charged with failing to respond to Board inquiries; and, that he willfully attempted to interfere with a Board investigation by making false statements concerning his activities related to the subject project.

As Mr. Fancett did not respond to the charges, the hearing was held by default and resulted in a Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Default Order signed by the Board chair on September 21, 2004. Said order suspended Mr. Fancett's license to practice as professional engineer for one year. During said suspension, Mr. Fancett is to complete an ethics course through Texas Tech University and pay a \$5,000 fine. If Mr. Fancett fails to complete any of the terms of the order, his license to practice as a professional engineer will be revoked.

Desiree' Brown, PE**Case No. 02-11-0003**

The Board's investigation of professional engineer Desiree Brown was based on allegations of unprofessional conduct related to the awarding of a city contract to the engineering firm that employed Ms. Brown. Ms. Brown admitted that in her activities related to the competitive bid process for the city contract, she failed to avoid all known or potential conflicts of interest with her client and failed to disclose to her employer or client a conflict of interest which could influence the decision by the city in awarding the contract to her employer.

It was the case manager's opinion that Ms. Brown's conduct failed to meet the expectations of a professional engineer and authorized the issuance of a Statement of Charges. In conjunction with the charging documents, Ms. Brown was offered a

settlement opportunity. Terms of settlement included a reprimand, a \$500 administrative fine and completion of the Texas Tech Ethics Course.

Kee Hoon Pak, Case No. 03-06-0002

The Board opened this investigation based upon information provided by a Professional Engineer that Mr. Pak, and his firm, Key Engineering, was offering engineering services without being licensed. Said information stated that Mr. Pak and his firm were publishing documents under the name of Key Engineering, and Mr. Pak was using the title "Environmental Engineer" on these reports.

The Case Manager authorized the issuance of a *Notice of Intent to Issue a Cease and Desist Order*, and offered a hearing into the matter. As Mr. Pak did not respond, a hearing was held by default, and resulted in a *Finding of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Permanent Cease and Desist Order*. Said Order prevents Mr. Pak from practicing engineering unless he is under the direct supervision of a licensed professional engineer. He was also required to pay \$9,840 civil fine to the Board, all but \$1000 of which was deferred for a period of thirty days of the date of the Order.

INFORMAL ACTIONS:**Engineering****Case No. 03-02-0001**

This complaint involved allegations that an engineering firm was: offering engineering services without a professional engineer (PE) in responsible charge; making negative comments about the complainant's firm; and had provided negligent geotechnical engineering services. The Practice Committee decided that the allegations of negligent engineering and maligning comments were not substantiated, but opened an investigation to look into the working relationship between the respondent engineering firm and the firm's designated engineer. During the course of the investigation the respondent engineering firm and the firm's designated PE provided numerous documents in regards to the firm's engineering activities and the role of the designated PE in those activities.

The case manager found that the evidence substanti-

ates that the designated PE was an employee of the respondent engineering firm, as needed, until August 2, 2004 and had been approved as the designated engineer of that firm. While the original allegations were not substantiated the respondent firm's officers were reminded that Board rule requires notification of any changes to the designated engineer assignment within 30 days if such change.

Case No. 04-02-0004

The Board opened an investigation of an engineering corporation based upon information provided by a Professional Engineer suggested that the firm might be violating RCW 18.43.130 by offering engineering services to the general public beyond the limits of an industrial exemption. During the investigation a representative of the firm admitted that they were offering and providing engineering services to the general public, but had not recognized they were doing so unlawfully and agreed to come into compliance with the laws of the state of Washington as they apply to corporations.

After many weeks of apparent inaction it was the case manager's belief that the firm's effort toward compliance was not making the expected progress. Upon his authorization, the Board issued a *Notice of Intent to Issue a Cease and Desist Order* on July 2, 2004. This *Notice* was a formal announcement by the Board that they were preparing to pursue administrative remedies for the firm's failure to come into compliance. This *Notice* gave the firm 20 days to request a hearing. Within that 20-day period the firm came into compliance with the laws of the state of Washington by filing the necessary forms, affidavits and fees.

Case No. 03-07-0001

This investigation involved allegations that a Professional Engineer directly, and indirectly injured another professional's personal and professional reputation by making false and malicious comments to employees, stockholders and friends. In response, the PE respondent denied the allegations, stating that the two of them (co-workers) were not getting along for a variety of reasons, and that other staff realized that they were not on good terms, and the morale of the firm was rapidly deteriorating at that time. The

Board of Directors had to make a decision to prevent further dissension and instability in the corporate direction of the firm, and decided that the complainant needed to leave the firm. After review the case manager concluded that while the complainant may feel that he has been damaged, the allegations did not present circumstances within the Board's jurisdiction.

Case No. 04-09-0006

This investigation involved allegations that an engineering firm failed to complete the necessary notification (within 30 days) of a change to their designated PE. The required paperwork was immediately submitted, after notification of the investigation was sent to the firm. No disciplinary action was taken.

Land Surveying

Case No. 03-11-0002

This investigation was opened based on a complaint from four individuals against a professional land surveyor (PLS), his firm, and various firm employees. The complaint was filed in regards to the respondent's activities in property development and alleged conflict of interest, modifications to submitted documents and changes made to easements and roads that weren't built. The PLS, in his response to the allegations, explained the subject project, such as what his roles were in the survey and engineering of his client's property, county approvals of the project and the relationship with his client.

The case manager concluded that while the complainants feel that they have been damaged, they have sought relief from the wrong source, as the Board has no jurisdiction on the civil disputes alleged. With confirming evidence of appropriate county approvals the Case Manager found no evidence to support allegations of conduct in violation of Board rule.

Case No. 04-01-0001

This investigation was opened based on a complaint from a property owner alleging that the survey performed for his neighbor by a professional land surveyor (PLS) placed their common boundary line

in error and the legal description shown on the survey does not match the property deed. To support his allegations, he provided a record of survey performed on his property by another PLS. Of particular concern was that second surveyor found a monument not previously located in the respondent's survey.

While the respondent admitted to typographical errors on the legal description, the case manager also noted that the subject survey failed to include a narrative to address his control scheme and failed to show what assumptions he made. Also noted by the case manager was that the respondent should evaluate his survey and the position of property corners in light of the monument found since his survey. Subsequently, the PLS submitted an Amended Record of Survey.

Case No. 04-01-0002

This investigation, initiated by the Board, was the result of staff's review of a record of survey submitted during the course of another investigation. As this review showed the subject survey failed to meet minimum standards, the PLS was notified and immediately submitted an Amended Record of Survey. The case manager found the amendment failed to provide a clear explanation for an offset monument, the basis of bearing and, provide the itemized changes to the original survey map. The PLS submitted another amendment that met the requirements of state rules and laws.

Continued from page 2

Message from the Chair

Lately, I've heard the arguments that say a candidate for licensure should be allowed to take the principles and practice exam as soon as he/she has passed the fundamentals exam. Since an individual who has achieved senior standing in an accredited engineering program would be allowed to take the fundamentals exam, it would be possible for that individual to take the principles and practice exam before even receiving a Bachelor's degree in engineering. The argument proceeds like this: Joe E. Bushy engineer graduates from college, and he gets a job in a very specialized field of engineering. Four years later, when he has the required experience, he applies to take the principles and practice exam. Joe has forgotten much of what he learned in his basic field of engineering and must study those areas in order to pass the exam. Therefore, Joe should be allowed to take the exam prior to meeting the experience requirement for licensure so he can more easily pass the exam.

In my opinion this logic is flawed. Maybe we should be asking whether the principles and practice exam is even relevant (at least for some engineers). How does passing an examination on subject matter an engineer does not use in his area of practice protect the public? How does passing an examination on subject matter an engineer does not use in his area of practice show he is competent in his area of practice?

I am not advocating abandoning a licensure model that

has worked well for many decades and continues to be appropriate for most engineers. I do believe it is time to consider that there may be other paths for engineers who do not fit within a traditional engineering discipline (and exam module).

I have had the privilege of observing firsthand the licensing process in British Columbia. For those who have come through the Canadian university system, there are no technical exams. Rather than exams, there are rigorous assessments of an applicant's experience and development as an engineer. From all appearances it seems to me that both the United States and Canada's process for licensing engineers work with regard to the goals of protecting the public and assuring the competency of the engineering profession. Maybe it's time to consider an alternate path similar to the Canadian model in Washington for those engineers who work in some specialized niche and do not fit within a traditional engineering discipline (for example Forest Engineering). And why not consider comity for engineers licensed in foreign jurisdictions under licensure models that achieve the same goals as the licensure model in Washington.

These are just my opinions. Some food for thought. What do you think?



Customer Satisfaction Survey

The Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, the Onsite Advisory Committee and the management of the Department of Licensing, are seeking comments from our customers about the service and products we provide. The results of this survey will help us identify how we are performing and where we could make improvements in the services and products we provide. In addition, at the end of the survey you are invited to provide any additional comments on subjects that may not have been covered in the questions below.

Please take the time to complete this survey and return it to us via FAX: (360) 664-2551 or by regular mail: P.O. Box 9025, Olympia, WA, 98507-9025.

1. Please rank the top three of the following existing services in their order of importance to you.

- ___ Access to understandable forms and instructions.
- ___ A fair and efficient licensing process.
- ___ Accurate and current information on the Board Web site.
- ___ Renew a license online.
- ___ Access to licensed Board staff for information or consultation.
- ___ Participation in Board decision-making.
- ___ Effective and balanced law enforcement.
- ___ Regular publication of the *Washington Board Journal*.

SECTION A: Application Processing

Please answer the following questions about your experience when applying for a license or a certificate with the Board. If you have not submitted an application, please proceed to SECTION B.

2. Which of the following applications have you submitted within the past two years?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> PE (exam) | <input type="checkbox"/> PLS (comity) | <input type="checkbox"/> Onsite Designer | <input type="checkbox"/> Corporation /Limited Liability Company |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PE (comity) | <input type="checkbox"/> EIT | <input type="checkbox"/> Onsite Inspector | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PLS (exam) | <input type="checkbox"/> LSIT | | |

3. How satisfied were you in the services you received? (Circle the number that best represents your response to the statement, where 1 represents DISAGREE up to 5 being AGREE)

| | Disagree | | | Agree | |
|---|----------|---|---|-------|---|
| A. The information and instructions for completing the application were understandable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. You were provided an explanation of the application review process and the amount of time required to make a decision. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. If you were found ineligible for licensure, you were provided an explanation of your appeal opportunities and the process. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. You received courteous and prompt service from Board staff. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Disagree | | | Agree | |
|--|----------|---|---|-------|---|
| E. The Board staff member you last contacted was knowledgeable and well informed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. If you were required to register for examination through the NCEES / ELSES web site, the information and instructions were understandable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. If you took an examination, <i>and you passed</i> , you were given complete information on what steps and timeline remained before a license/certificate would be issued. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| H. If you took an examination, <i>and you failed</i> , you were given complete information on what steps were required to be eligible for a subsequent examination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I. You received your PE or PLS license within 2 weeks of when you were notified of having passed the examination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| J. You received your wall certificate within 8 weeks of when you were notified of passing the examination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| K. Overall, I am satisfied with the processing and notifications I received about my application. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

SECTION B: Online Services

Please answer these questions if you have used the online services and products available from the Board. If you have not, please answer the last question in this section and proceed to SECTION C.

4. How often do you use online services from the Board?

- ☐ Weekly
 ☐ 1 to 3 times a year
☐ Monthly
 ☐ Never
☐ 1 to 3 times every 6 months

5. Please rank the top three of the following online services in their order of importance to you. If you have not used

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Downloadable forms | <input type="checkbox"/> Links to related sites |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Renew a license | <input type="checkbox"/> Access to laws and rules |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Access list of licensees for license status | <input type="checkbox"/> Special articles and announcements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Access past Board Journals | <input type="checkbox"/> Board information (members, phone numbers address, hours) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Email notification of Board notices | |

6. How satisfied were you with the online services you received? (Circle the number that best represents your response to the statement, where 1 represents DISAGREE up to 5 being AGREE)

| | Disagree | | | Agree | |
|---|----------|---|---|-------|---|
| A. The Board website displayed pertinent information. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. The Board website was easy to Navigate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Disagree | | | Agree | |
|--|----------|---|---|-------|---|
| C. It is easy to lookup information on licensees. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. The links included on the Board website are useful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. The ability to review past <i>Journal</i> editions on the web site is useful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. The process to renew a license online was easy to follow. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. Overall, I am satisfied with the online services provided. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

7. If you have not used the online *LICENSE RENEWAL* service, please let us know why? (mark all that apply)

- ☐ I prefer not to do transactions online for any reason.
☐ I am not confident of the security for online business transactions.
☐ I do not use MasterCard or Visa.
☐ The instructions were unclear and confusing.
☐ I did not know that online renewals were available.
☐ I intended to but forgot about it.

SECTION C: Washington Board Journal

8. Have you read the *Washington Board Journal* in the past year?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

9. If yes, please **rank the top three** of the following list of articles that appear in the *Journal* in their order of importance to you.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Message from the Chair | <input type="checkbox"/> Topical articles on engineering practice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Examination results | <input type="checkbox"/> Topical articles on land surveying practice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board events schedule | <input type="checkbox"/> Questions and Answers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> As the "Courts See It" | <input type="checkbox"/> Onsite licensing issues and information. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disciplinary Report | <input type="checkbox"/> Board staff and office contact information. |

10. How satisfied were you with the content and presentation of the *Washington Board Journal*? (Circle the number that best represents your response to the statement, where 1 represents DISAGREE up to 5 being AGREE)

| | Disagree | | | Agree | |
|--|----------|---|---|-------|---|
| A. The <i>Journal</i> is organized in a professional and user-friendly format. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. I find that the <i>Journal</i> contains information that is useful to me as a licensee. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. I refer back to the <i>Journal</i> for clarification of a question or a situation I have encountered. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. I share my copy of the <i>Journal</i> with others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Overall, I am satisfied in the Content and presentation of the <i>Journal</i> . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

SECTION D: Informational Inquiries

11. When you contact the Board office, what method(s) do you prefer to use? (mark all that apply)

- ☐ Phone
 ☐ Fax
 ☐ Courier (FedEx/UPS etc.)
- ☐ Email
 ☐ US mail
 ☐ Office visit

12. How many times in the past two years have you contacted the Board office?

None 1 2 3 4 5+

13. When you contacted the Board office, how many attempts were necessary to obtain the information you were seeking?

N/A 1 2 3 4 5+

14. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with your most recent contact with our office. (Circle the number that best represents your response to the statement, where 1 represents DISAGREE up to 5 being AGREE)

| | Disagree | | | Agree | |
|--|----------|---|---|-------|---|
| A. The phone voice message I left was replied to within 24 hours. I was able to speak with the person I was attempting to reach. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. I received the information I needed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. The staff member who assisted me was courteous. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. The staff member who assisted me was knowledgeable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. The message I sent was acknowledged or replied to within one week. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. I was able to speak directly to one of the licensed staff on a special topic of interest. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. Overall, I was given quality service when I last contacted the Board. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Use this space to provide any clarification to your responses or to further help us identify areas of our service delivery that can be improved.

Examination Schedule

FALL – 2005 ADMINISTRATION

| Examination | Type | Examination Date | Application Deadline |
|--|-------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Agricultural, Chemical, Civil, Control Systems, Electrical, Environmental, Fire Protection, Industrial, Mechanical, Metallurgical, Mining/Mineral, Nuclear, Petroleum, and Structural II Engineering | NCEES | Friday October 28, 2005 | Tuesday June 28, 2005 |
| Forest Engineering | State | Friday October 28, 2005 | Tuesday June 28, 2005 |
| Land Surveying (6-hour) | NCEES | Friday October 28, 2005 | Tuesday June 28, 2005 |
| Land Surveying (2-hour) | State | Friday October 28, 2005 | Tuesday June 28, 2005 |
| Fundamentals of Engineering & Fundamentals of Land Surveying | NCEES | Saturday October 29, 2005 | Wednesday June 29, 2005 |
| Structural III | State | Saturday October 29, 2005 | Wednesday June 29, 2005 |
| On-Site Wastewater Designer / Inspector Certification | State | Saturday October 29, 2005 | Friday July 29, 2005 |

2005 Calendar of Events

APRIL

27-28 Committee & Board Meeting *La Quinta Inn,
Federal Way*

MAY

19-21 NCEES Western Zone Meeting *Anchorage, Alaska*

JUNE

22-23 Committee & Board Meeting *La Quinta Inn,
Federal Way*

AUGUST

10-11 Committee & Board Meeting *TBD*
24-27 NCEES Annual Meeting *Memphis, TN*

OCTOBER

5-6 Committee & Board Meeting *TBD*
28-29 Exam Administration *Seattle & Spokane
Area*

NOVEMBER

30 Committee Meetings *TBD*

DECEMBER

1 Special Board Meeting *TBD*